	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/006,597	HILGERT, CHRISTOPH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael J Kyle	3676
All Participants:	Status of Application	n:
(1) <u>Michael J Kyle</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Abraham Ronai</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 21 December 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic	cant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 17, 18		
Prior art documents discussed:  Jacobs, Pearlstein, Ueta		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
		•
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/006,597

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed additional language to claims 17 and 18 to overcome the prior art and place the application into condition for allowance. Applicant's representative did not agree to the proposed changes. Examiner stated the rejection of claims 17 and 18 will be maintained in the next Office Action. The proposed language by the examiner included a limitation that the hydraulic fluid or medium is liquid at least under operating conditions. This limitations is similar to a limitation in claim 29 of the instant application.